UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,) Case No. CR - 13 713 mag 22 1 1
Plaintiff, v. 14emau: Pare L Defendant.	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING POLE UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record Speedy Trial Act from \(\lambda / \frac{1}{2} \rangle \), 2013 to _	on 1/7, 2013, the Court excludes time under the 1/9, 2013 and finds that the ends of justice served the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § bases this continuance on the following factor(s):
Failure to grant a continuance woul See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	ld be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
defendants, the nature of the or law, that it is unreasonable to ex	ex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact pect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial shed by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
	d deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, due diligence. <i>See</i> 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
counsel's other scheduled case come See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). Failure to grant a continuance would	d unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given amitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. d unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
IT IS SO ORDERED.	
DATED: 11 /21 13	JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney